<u>Amendments to the Drawings</u>:

The attached replacement sheets of drawings include changes to Fig. 8 and 23 and replaces the original sheet including Fig. 8 and 23.

In Figures 8 and 23, the entire view is now presented in an opposite direction.

Attachments following last page of this Amendment:

Replacement Sheet (2 pages)

REMARKS

In the Action mailed May 5, 2006, the Examiner rejected the pending claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and § 103(a). The Examiner objected to some of the figures as not showing the features described in the specification, and to page 12 of the specification which had been left blank. In reply, Applicants are submitting replacement sheets for Figures 8 and 23, and are amending the specification to remove the blank page. As such, claim 1 remains pending. Applicants request reconsideration of claim 1 in view of the amendment and the following remarks.

Drawing Objections – 37 CFR 1.83(a)

The Examiner objected to Figures 2-6, 9-22, 24-29 and 31 because they allegedly "fail to show the features page 14, line 11 to page 64, line 9 as described in the specification." The Office Action also included a Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, which stated that Figures 8 and 23 were objected to as having "[n]umbers and reference characters not oriented in the same direction as the view." Applicants will address these objections in order.

Applicant respectfully traverses the objection that Figures 2-6, 9-22, 24-29 and 31 do not show the features described in the specification. First, Applicants submit that the drawings do show the features described in the specification. Following are two examples illustrating how the drawings show the features of the specification:

For example, the description for Figure 2 in the specification discusses a semcard 1, data 2, reference 3, external entity 4, computer-readable medium 5, tags 6, definition 11, external ontology 7, standard nodes 8, relationships 9, data 12, display specification 14, data 15, reference 16, application 17, computer-readable medium 18, tags 19, and definition 20. Figure 2 shows the semcard 1, the data 2, the reference 3, the external entity 4, the computer-readable medium 5, the tags 6, the definition 11, the external ontology 7, the standard nodes 8, the relationships 9, the data 12, the display specification 14, the data 15, the reference 16, the application 17, the computer-readable medium 18, the tags 19, and the definition 20. Accordingly, Figure 2 shows the corresponding features described in the specification.

As another example, the description for Figure 3 in the specification discusses a semcard 1, reference 13, display specification 14, reference 8, ontology 7, computer-readable medium 5, and reference 9. Figure 3 shows the semcard 1, the reference 13, the display specification 14, the reference 8, the ontology 7, the computer-readable medium 5, and the reference 9. Accordingly, Figure 3 shows the corresponding features described in the specification.

Similarly, the features described in the remainder of the specification are shown by the corresponding figures.

In view of the above, it is respectfully requested that the objection against Figures 2-6, 9-22, 24-29 and 31 be removed. Second, to the extent that the Examiner maintains the above objection, Applicants request that the next Office Action specifically cite each feature of the specification that is considered not to be shown.

With regard to the objection against Figures 8 and 23, Applicants have reviewed these drawings but have found that all of the numbers and reference characters are aligned with the view. As such, Applicants do not know what the objection refers to. Applicants are therefore assuming that the objection relates to the orientation of these figures in their entirety. Applicants are therefore submitting replacement sheets where Figures 8 and 23 have been presented in another orientation. It is noted that no other amendments to these figures have been done at this point, for the reasons explained above. No new matter is added. In view of the submitted replacement sheets, it is respectfully requested that the objection be removed.

Specification Objection – MPEP 606

The Examiner objected to the specification because page 12 had been left blank. In response, Applicants are amending the specification to remove the blank page 12. No new matter is added. Thus, Applicants ask that the objection to the specification be removed.

Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and stated that the invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Particularly, the Examiner cited the step of claim 1 that begins "storing ..." and stated that it does not produce any useful and tangible result.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that the Examiner's position is not supported by either the law or the facts in this regard. First, Applicant's claim 1 recites the steps of "creating an offer semantic object and a request semantic object ..." and "storing specific data of a request ... and specific data of an offer ...". The offer semantic object and the request semantic object that result from the creation and storing steps are such that they can be "routed in a network" as specified by the last clause of claim 1. Moreover, that clause of the claim also states that each of the semantic objects "contains policies that determine how each semantic object should be matched." Thus, the semantic objects that are created in this method contain specific data of an offer and request, respectively, they can be routed in a network, and they can be matched according to policies that they contain.

Applicants submit that the created semantic objects are tangible such that they qualify as statutory subject matter. Moreover, they are useful in the sense that they can be routed in a network and that they can be matched. For example, it is described in the specification that "[a] user establishes relationships with other users by exchanging offers and requests for relationship invitations semcard among user accounts." (Page 57, lines 6-7.) Thus, the subject matter recited in claim 1 leads to a result that is both tangible and useful. Applicants therefore request that the rejection be removed.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over 6,513,059 (Gupta) in view of 5,809,297 (Kroenke). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Applicants' claim 1 is directed to a method that includes creating offer and request semantic objects and storing specific data in each of them. The objects are routed in a network and contain policies that determine how each of them should be matched. Applicants submit that

neither Gupta nor Kroenke, alone or in combination, anticipates or renders obvious a method in which offer and request semantic objects are created, provided with specific data, routed in a network and which objects contain policies regarding matching.

Gupta discloses an "adaptive collaborative intelligent network system" in which context nodes serve as hubs and software programs called network agents ("Awits") serve as spokes. (Col. 4, lines 44-51.) The Awits participate in one or more contexts by receiving and/or sending messages to a subscribed node in that context. (Col. 7, lines 37-43.) There are tree Awits (col. 13, lines 6-23) and system or application Awits (col. 13, lines 24-31). The system or application Awit sends a performative to a blackboard of the node, "preferably using semantic messaging". (Col. 13, lines 27-29.) Performatives include assigned tasks and responsibilities. (Col. 6, lines 54-58.) In contrast, the tree Awit receives the semantic message and routes it to a particular node "[u]sing the tree Awit's knowledge of the tree structure." (Col. 13, lines 17-21.) Thus, it is the tree Awit's knowledge of the tree structure, and not a policy contained in an offer or request semantic object, that is used for the routing in Kroenke.

The use of templates taught in Gupta does not involve the creation of offer and request semantic objects. Rather, "[a]n Awit reads (and thereby receives) messages at a subscribed node using a template *that identifies topics of concern to the Awit* and filters and discards all other messages." (Col. 11, lines 30-33.) Thus, Gupta does not teach that templates be used in creating offer and request semantic objects.

Thus, Gupta does not show or suggest the creation of offer and request semantic objects, providing them with specific data, wherein the objects are routed in a network and contain policies regarding matching.

Kroenke discloses a "semantic object modeling system for creating relational database schemas." (Title.) Kroenke was cited as allegedly showing "creating an offer semantic object," with reference to col. 5, lines 29-30 of Kroenke. However, Applicants note that none of the objects taught in Kroenke appears to fit the meaning of an "offer semantic object" or a "request semantic object" as used in the present claim. Rather, the "semantic objects" taught in Kroenke are created to create a data model (col. 5, lines 26-29), and the examples include a professor,

student, class and parent objects (Kroenke Fig. 1). Thus, Kroenke does not show or suggest the creation of offer and request semantic objects, providing them with specific data, wherein the objects are routed in a network and contain policies regarding matching.

Neither of Gupta and Kroenke discloses or suggests a method in which offer and request semantic objects are created and provided with specific data, wherein the objects are routed in a network and contain policies regarding matching. As such, it cannot be said that Applicants' independent claim 1 is rendered obvious by these references. Independent claim 1 is therefore patentable over the combination of Gupta and Kroenke.

Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner remove his obviousness rejection of independent claim 1.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that the claim 1 is in condition for allowance, and request favorable consideration of this claim. Applicants reserve the right to add one or more claims depending from independent claim 1.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

This response is filed within the shortened statutory period and no fee is therefore due. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Applicant   : Nova Spivack
Serial No. : 10/720,031
Filed   : November 20, 2003
Page   : 9 of 9

Attorney's Docket No.: 15561-019001

Respectfully submitted,

Date:_____ 8/7/06 _____

J. Richard Soderberg
Reg. No. 43,352

Fish & Richardson P.C., P.A.
60 South Sixth Street
Suite 3300
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (612) 288-9696

60371653.doc